

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 remain in this application. Claims 1-9 have been amended to make it clear that the coiled threads are straight. Claim 8 has been amended to clearly align a recital with its antecedent basis. Claim 9 has been amended to accommodate new dependent claim 10. New independent claim 11 has been added.

In amended Figs. 6 and 7, the superfluous element numerals 50 and 54 have been removed.

The specification has been amended to provide support for the use of the term "straight" in the claims. This amendment to the specification is based on the drawings, which show straight, as distinct from tapered threads. See, for example, Fig. 1. Also, the helical nature of the thread is noted, for example at P. 6, Lns. 9 and 13 of the present specification. A helix by definition is laid down on a cylindrical surface, and is, therefore, a straight thread. Further support appears, for example, in the description of diameter of the thread at P. 8, Lns. 19-23.

The objection that the drawings do not show an internal coil thread is respectfully traversed. Fig. 1 shows an internal coil thread. This Fig. 1 is described, P. 4 Lns. 15-16, of the present specification as "an internally threaded bore wherein the thread is a new coil thread with a convex profile". Fig. 3 shows "a worn internal coil thread with the profile of a new a new internal coil thread superimposed", P. 4, Lns 20-21. Fig. 6 shows a "worn internal concave coil thread", P. 5, Lns. 8-9. Fig. 7 shows "a new internal concave coil thread", P. 5, Lns. 12-13.

The rejection of the claims as unpatentable over Gazanchan et al. in view of Roley is respectfully traversed.

Gazanchan et al., insofar as can be determined from the abstract, is directed to a template for measuring the wear on an internal conical thread. That is, the thread is on the surface of a cone. This is a tapered thread. The drawing Figure shows that this is not a coil thread. The tips of the tapered screw thread are shown in the drawing Figure of this reference as having been worn away. It appears from this Figure that the increases in the diameter of the conical internal thread as it wears are being measured. The entire page 3 of the present specification, for example, describes why just measuring the changes in the diameter of a coil thread is not a reliable measure of whether it is too worn for continued use. This reference does not recognize the problem with straight coiled threads that the present invention solves. For conical threads, the increase in diameter of the internal thread is probably the most important measure of wear, because as the diameter increases the conical threaded parts release from one another after less relative rotation. When worn, the conical threadably engaged parts are at risk of falling apart because of diametric thread wear. If it requires, for example, two full revolutions to release a new conical thread, a worn internal conical thread with an enlarged diameter might take only half a revolution to release it. There is no indication that the template of the reference will not thread into a new unworn thread. To be useful it would be necessary that it thread into both worn and unworn threads. The present invention will not thread into a new coil thread. In fact, it will not thread into a coil thread until it is too worn to be used. The present invention addresses a

different problem in a different way. The teachings of this reference as to testing the diametric wear of conical threads are not relevant to testing straight coil threads.


Roley is directed to a flat template for measuring sprocket wear. This is a different art and it is not analogous to the art in which the present invention is located. The reference does not mention coil threads or the wear of coil threads. Roley's template does not threadably engage a sprocket or a thread. Roley's flat template is not analogous to Applicant's gauging thread. Sprocket teeth are not analogous to coiled threads.

The combination of Gazanchan et al. and Roley lacks any teaching that is relevant to measuring the wear of a straight coiled thread. The combination lacks any teaching of using a gauging thread that indicates excessive wear when it can be threadably engaged with the straight coiled thread.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELASCO JACOBS & TOWNSLEY LLP

By   
Bruce A. Jagger  
Reg. No. 19,968

Bruce A. Jagger  
Belasco Jacobs & Townsley LLP  
6100 Center Drive, Ste. 630  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Tel.: (310) 846-4795  
Fax: (310) 846-4799  
e-mail: bjagger@bjtlaw.com

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 6 and 7. This sheet, which includes Fig. 5-9, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5-9.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet